

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/538,731	03/30/2000	Kenneth J. Myers	BEU/FORESITE4	8860	
7	590 03/08/2002				
Bacon & Thomas			EXAMINER		
625 Slaters Lane 4th Floor Alexandria, VA 22314-1176			WINSTEDT, JENNIFER E		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2872		
		•	DATE MAILED: 03/08/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Application No.	Applicant(s)
.	•	09/538,731	MYERS, KENNETH J.
	Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit
		Jennifer E Winstedt	2872
D	The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication app		correspondence address
- Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any I	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day all apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 E	ecember 2001	
2a)⊠		s action is non-final.	
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters in	resocution on to the marity is
Dispositi	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i> on of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>8 and 10-12</u> is/are pending in the app	lication.	•
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
	Claim(s) <u>8 and 10-12</u> is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement	
Application	on Papers	oloston rodanomont.	
9)□ T	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) <u></u> ⊤	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accept	ed or b)☐ objected to by the Exar	miner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11)[] T		is: a)□ approved b)□ disappro	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in repl		
12) 🗌 T	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	miner.	
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) 🗌 🛚 A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).
_] All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.	
2	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Applicatio	on No
	Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure the attached detailed Office action for a list of	y documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	d in this National Stage
	knowledgment is made of a claim for domestic		
a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language provi	sional application has been rece	ived.
Attachment(s	·		
2) Notice (3) Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal Pa	PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)
. Patent and Trad O-326 (Rev.		on Summary	Part of Paper No. 13

Application/Control Number: 09/538,731

Art Unit: 2872

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 10 and 11 are depended on claim 9. Since claim 9 has been canceled, it is impossible to ascertain the true scope of claims 10 and 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Powell (U.S. Patent 5,483,254).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Powell discloses a stereoscopic effects device that has a housing that is a housing of a handheld video game player (column 2, lines 4-7) and a video display screen that is an LCD screen (column 2, lines 40-43).

Art Unit: 2872

Claim R jecti ns - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheiman (U.S. Patent 4,588,259) in view of Chikazawa (U.S. Patent 5,896,225) and Powell (U.S. Patent 5,483,254).

Regarding claim 8, Sheiman discloses a stereoscopic effects device comprising an image interlacing arrangement including at least one video display screen (10, Figure 7); a microprism sheet (16, Figure 7) including a substrate (22, Figure 7) and a plurality of grooves having intersecting sides that form a v-shape (24, Figure 7), the sides of the grooves forming first and second sets of substantially planar surfaces (24, Figure 7); wherein the sides of the grooves are respectively arranged to refract light from first and second image sources (12, 14, Figure 7) so that the light from separate first and second images on the video display screen exits the microprism sheet to form an interlaced image (20, Figure 2); polarizers situated between the video display screen and the microprism sheet (15, 17, Figure 7); and polarized filters situated between the microprism sheet and respective left and right eyes of a person (27, 29, Figure 7). Sheiman does not disclose the sides of the grooves being arranged so that light exits the microprism sheet in parallel and all of the components of the stereoscopic effects device (the video display screen, the microprism sheet, polarizers, and polarized filters)

'Application/Control Number: 09/538,731

Art Unit: 2872

being situated in a common housing. Chikazawa discloses grooves of a microprism sheet that are arranged such that light from first and second images exits the microprism sheet in parallel (12, Figures 8 and 9 and column 3, lines 16-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the grooves of Sheiman be arranged such that light exits the microprism sheet in parallel as Chikazawa suggests in order to produce a simple and inexpensive arrangement which visualizes a stereoscopic image via a pixel-like registration and/or display (column 1, lines 24-26; Chikazawa). Powell discloses that having all components of a stereoscopic effects device be situated in a common housing is well known in the art (column 11, lines 62-63; the components of the stereoscopic display would have to be situated in a common housing or the hand-held computer game could not be handheld). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have all of the components of the stereoscopic effects device of the combination be situated in a common housing as Powell suggests in order to allow a user the flexibility of using the device whenever and wherever the user desires.

Regarding claim 12, the combination discloses the claimed invention as described above except for the video display screen being an LCD screen. Powell discloses that the use of LCD screens is well known in the art (column 2, lines 40-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the video display screen of the combination be an LCD screen as Powell

Application/Control Number: 09/538,731

Art Unit: 2872

suggests in order to provide a very flat viewing screen and a light-weight portable display device (column 2, lines 43-46; Powell).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument neither Sheiman nor Powell discloses or suggests placement of a microprism sheet, polarizers, and polarized filters in a common housing, the examiner points out that Powell discloses that placing all components of a stereoscopic effects device in a common housing is well known. The teaching of the components of the stereoscopic effects device comprising a microprism sheet, polarizers, and polarized filters comes from Sheiman. The motivation to combine the teaching of Powell with the teachings of Sheiman is to be able to more easily transport the stereoscopic effects device around and allow a user to use the device whenever and wherever the user desires. Therefore, the combination of Sheiman and Powell does indeed suggest placement of a microprism sheet, polarizers, and polarized filters in a common housing.

Art Unit: 2872

In response to applicant's argument that since Sheiman's polarized filters are in the form of glasses designed to be worn by a user, Sheiman's filters could not be placed in a housing, the examiner points out that Figure 7 of the reference shows polarized filters that are not in the form of glasses designed to be worn by a user. Therefore, there is at least one embodiment of Sheiman that has polarized filters that can be placed in a housing.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the housing cropping or masking the images so that ghost images are not visible, the housing limiting the field of view, or the housing fixing the polarized filters with respect to the other components) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Specifically, the term "housing" is not explicitly defined in claims 8 and 12 and can therefore refer to any housing ranging from the building the stereoscopic device is located in to a cardboard box the device is shipped to a user in to a housing of a handheld device. Also, none of the claims require the housing to crop the images or limit the field of view or fix the polarized filters with respect to the other components.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

'Application/Control Number: 09/538,731

Art Unit: 2872

Page 7

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer E Winstedt whose telephone number is (703) 305-0577. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-17:00 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cassandra Spyrou can be reached on (703) 308-1687. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

JW

February 27, 2002

Cassandra Spyrou Supervisory ್ಡ್ ಜಿ Examiner Technology Corner 2ರೆಂರಿ